REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on September 6, 2005. Claims 1-31 were pending in the Office Action, and the Examiner rejected all claims. With this amendment, independent claims 1, 19 and 25 are amended and the remaining claims are unchanged in the application.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 1-18 based on an informality in claim 1. Applicant has amended claim 1 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Therefore, Applicant submits that the claims are now in proper form.

On pages 3-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-17 and 19-31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Grefenstette US Patent No. 6,289,304 in view of Kudrolli et al. US Patent No. 6,279,018. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

The present invention receives an input text having a plurality of different portions (such as a plurality of different words) and, for each portion, generates a plurality of different compression options based on a linguistic analysis of the input text. It should be emphasized that the plurality of different compression options, generated for each portion of the input text, are generated from the input text.

In order to meet this limitation of the independent claims, the Examiner cited Kudrolli et al. The cited portion of Kudrolli et al. mentions that a number of predefined abbreviation files can be generated, which hold a number of different abbreviations for given words, and the user can select which of the predefined abbreviation files to use during processing. See column 17, lines 25-36. The Examiner also cited a separate section of Kudrolli et al. which states that records in the reduction scope file are sequenced in descending order of reduction scope length, the object being to reach a required

reduction limit. In other words, it appears that Kudrolli et al. simply keeps applying reduction rules, or abbreviation rules, to continually abbreviate words in the input text until the input text is reduced to a predefined number of characters. See column 25, line 45-column 26, line 67.

Of course, both of these methods cited in Kudrolli et al. are completely different than the present invention. The first methodology (that of providing a number of predefined abbreviation files which list predefined abbreviations for given words) simply allows the user to choose one of the abbreviation files to use during processing. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the selected abbreviation file will output multiple abbreviations for a given word in the input text. Rather, the particular abbreviation file is selected by the user prior to subjecting the input text to compression processing. Then, it appears that only a single compressed form is generated for the words in the abbreviation file.

This is significantly different than the present invention which first receives the input text and then generates a plurality of different compression options for the different portions of the input text. For instance, independent claim 1 states "after performing the linguistic analysis, automatically generating a plurality of compression options for each of a plurality of different portions of the body of text to compress the body of text based on the linguistic output, each of the compression options comprising a different compressed form of an instance of the portion in the body of text; and selecting one of the plurality of compression options for each of the plurality of different portions of the body of text to output a compressed form of the body of text." Similarly, independent claim 25 states that the compression form generator is configured to "automatically generate a plurality of different compressed forms of individual text segments in the body of the text based on the

language analyses" and the compressor selects one of the different compressed forms for the individual text segments.

It is thus clear that this is significantly different from simply allowing the user to choose a predefined abbreviation file, that stores predefined abbreviations for different words, and then using that predefined abbreviation file during later compression of an input text.

Further, the second methodology cited by the Examiner in Kudrolli et al., again, simply continues compressing the textual input until it has been compressed sufficiently to meet a predefined number of characters (or a predefined length). This has nothing to do with automatically generating the plurality of different compression options for each portion of the input text, and then selecting one of those compression options to obtain the output as a compressed form of the body of text. There is simply no choice provided for the output in Kudrolli et al. The algorithm runs, continuing to reduce the length of the input text, until it meets a predefined length, and that is the output of the method. This is significantly different than the invention set out in independent claims 1 and 25.

The Examiner has acknowledged that Grefenstette does not teach these limitations of independent claims 1 and 25. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 25 is allowable over the references cited by the Examiner.

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent claim 19 for the same reasons as applied to claim 1 and again acknowledged that Grefenstette does not disclose a data structure having different sections relating to a textual term comprising a plurality of data fields representing a plurality of different compressed forms of the textual term. The Examiner then pointed to Kudrolli et al. in FIGS. 15 and 16 as meeting this limitation. However, it appears that FIGS. 15 and 16 of Kudrolli et al. are simply showing the result of application of

the different compression rules on the input text. However, it seems clear that the system of Kudrolli et al. does not generate all of these options and then allow a compressor to select one of the options for each of the different portions of the textual input.

Instead, the system in Kudrolli et al. simply keeps applying rules and compressing the text until the length of the compressed text is within a predefined limit. Then, the final instance of the compressed text is output as the compressed output. In other words, it does not appear that the system in Kudrolli et al. generates all of the different compression options for "Dr. Carrington, Joel Peter Philip, PHD", and then selects one of those compression options. Instead, Kudrolli et al. keeps applying compression rules, in a predefined order, until the entire textual input is shortened to a desired extent. Then, that compressed form is output as the final compressed form. There is no choosing one of the less compressed forms.

By contrast, independent claim 1 specifically claims that the computer readable data structure includes "a plurality of different sections, each section corresponding to a textual term in the body of text, each section further comprising a plurality of selectable data fields, selectable to represent a plurality of different compressed forms of the corresponding textual term in the body of text." Kudrolli et al. does not appear to provide a plurality of compressed forms of input text, where each of those plurality of compressed forms is selectable for the final output compressed form. Thus, Applicant submits that independent claim 19 is allowable over the references cited by the Examiner.

As described in previous responses, Applicant also submits that the dependent claims contain independently allowable subject matter. For instance, because the references neither teach nor suggest generating a plurality of compressed forms

which are provided for selection to obtain the final output compressed form, they cannot teach or suggest the compressed forms set out in the dependent claims. Moreover, as described in previous responses, a number of the dependent claims set out specific compressed forms that are simply neither taught nor suggested, or even mentioned by the references cited by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicant submits that the dependent claims are independently allowable as well.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 19 and 25 are allowable over the references cited by the Examiner. Applicant further submits that dependent claims 2-18, 20-24 and 26-31 are allowable both by virtue of their dependence on allowable independent claims, and because they are independently allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-31 are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: _____

Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847
Suite 1400 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JRK:slg